

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. VII

NEW YORK, APRIL 4, 1914

No. 22

Some of Professor Schmidt's remarks in his article on the Direct Method in the last number of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY reminded me of a paper by Professor Nutting in The Classical Journal for February last (9.222-226), entitled Reflections of a Non-Combatant.

Professor Nutting begins by declaring that whether the experiments now being made with the Direct Method of teaching Latin shall prove as successful as some of those using the Method hope and predict, the discussion of the subject seems likely to bring substantial results in its train. He expresses, however, by implication at least, the fear that allegiance to one method or another may divide our forces into opposing camps.

There may be little real danger of such disruption, but enthusiastic advocacy of some one method of teaching very naturally and insidiously runs into depreciation of all others. This point may be illustrated from the recent paper of Mr. Chickering in the *Classical Journal*.<sup>1</sup> As a whole, the article is temperate and fair; but, in speaking of the change of method incident to the decay of Latin as a spoken language, Mr. Chickering says: "the whole substance of the prevailing methods [of learning the language] was swept away, and what remained *was believed to have value partly because it was hard, partly because it was disagreeable*"<sup>2</sup>. And elsewhere he speaks of teaching Latin "in the old humdrum fashion".

To write in this way, continues Professor Nutting, is to play into the hands of the adversaries of Latin, and in so far to injure the very cause which the writer has at heart. The adversaries of Latin will be only too glad to quote such a statement by a teacher of Latin. "Especially will those be pleased who hold that discipline has no legitimate place in education, and that the proper way to train a child is to study his likes and dislikes, and then gently help him along the line of least resistance".

In this connection it would be well, I think, to read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest an article in the Educational Review for February last, by Superintendent William H. Maxwell, of New York City, entitled On a Certain Arrogance in Educational Theorists. I do not believe in imitating the ostrich;

nor do I believe that the inhabitants of a citadel should themselves throw down its walls as soon as the foe sounds his blast (much less before he blows his trumpet). No one interested in the cause of the Classics can truthfully deny there are things, many things that need correction. We need in Latin work as elsewhere (let us never forget the 'elsewhere') more teachers with better minds, with better training, with better knowledge of their subject, with richer personalities—in a word better men and better women, better trained (such men and women are needed in every walk of life); all this and more we can admit without, however, saying, or implying that our cause is hopelessly lost, or that the work of thousands of skillful and devoted persons is hopelessly useless to the world unless some one specific thing is done. When will the champions of a given thing learn that wholesale condemnation of every thing else defeats their propaganda, by irritating others and thereby closing their minds and hearts to the appeal in the behalf of the new or of return to the old?

What we need now is not more talk of a theoretical sort concerning the Direct Method, but use of the Direct Method, and a careful examination of the results of such use. Mere declarations that a given method is a panacea for all our woes, however many or vigorous the declarations may be, have in themselves little, if any, value. We need, as Professor Yocum pointed out some time ago (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7. 105-110) the testimony of actual experience, based on sound educational principles. That testimony must come from many quarters; it must come in ample volume; it must extend over some years; it must be subjected to the severest scrutiny not merely by those who stand ready to adopt the method when its claims are proved, though they do not employ it now, but also of those who are at present distinctly hostile to the Direct Method (if any such there are). The pupils trained by the Direct Method must be subjected to tests, not merely by those who have trained them, but by others; they must endure those tests with success, or else the claims of their teachers will make no deep or lasting impression on others. It will not do for those who advocate a given method to take, in terms or by

<sup>1</sup> IX, 2 (November, 1913), 67 ff.

<sup>2</sup> P. 70. Italics mine.

<sup>3</sup> *Classical Weekly*, VI, 5 (November 2, 1912), 35.

implication, the ground that their declarations and their testimony shall be accepted, as presented, by everyone else. To be unwilling to subject the evidence to scrutiny by the opponents, actual or imagined, of the method is to show, in reality, a lack of faith in the cause championed.

We do not in social or political life admit or ever seriously argue that the only persons that shall be heard on a given proposal are those who champion that proposal: why should we admit it or maintain it in educational matters?

The Direct Method, its advocates maintain, teaches grammar more effectively than other methods do; if this is so, pupils trained by the method should be able to prove their knowledge of Latin grammar, that is, of the actual facts of the Latin language, even to teachers who believe in other methods and via the usual examinations. The Direct Method gives, it is claimed, a more competent knowledge of Latin; its beneficiaries should, therefore, be better able than other pupils to stand any tests or pass any examinations (I am thinking of the end of the preparatory school course) not manifestly absurd and not dictated by malice. They should also be better able than other students to stand the test of work in College. Till, then, the evidence desiderated above is forthcoming, references to the teaching of Latin by 'the old method', 'in the old humdrum fashion' are to be deplored.

I was told not long ago of a meeting in New England at which the Direct Method was vigorously upheld by a Superintendent (whether of town or county or of state Schools I do not now recall). It was suggested that some light might be obtained from a College represented at the meeting which had in its Latin Classes two students who had been prepared by the Direct Method. The Superintendent protested and the College man was not heard. I think that the Superintendent knew or suspected that the evidence from a perfectly honorable witness would in this case be decidedly adverse to the Direct Method, so far as its value was representable by those two students, at least. Would he have protested had he thought the testimony likely to be favorable? One swallow does not make a spring, but so long as the advocates of the Direct Method rely so largely for a justification of their own propaganda on denunciation of the purposes, methods and results gained by other teachers of Latin, they have no moral or intellectual right to object to the appraisal of the results of their own work by others, as rapidly as specimens of that work appear.

Some years ago, I was appointed Chairman of a Committee of The New York Latin Club, which was instructed to consider the subject of First Year Latin, with special reference to the New York City High Schools, with a view to having changes made in the

Latin work of the First Year, if changes seemed desirable. Just after that Committee was appointed, the agitation in this country for the Direct Method began. The Committee has never made a report. Its chairman has been waiting for the time when evidence enough shall have accumulated to make it clear whether the Direct Method will work in practice. I was much interested in Professor Nutting's paper in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* (7.154-157) on Latin in the Seventh and Eighth Grades in California, since I had for many years thought that if the period of infancy of our Latin pupils could be prolonged, if they could have a longer period in which to get the fundamentals of the language—by any method—with far more time for drill in those fundamentals before they attacked the literature, no part of which was ever meant for babes and sucklings, their ultimate progress would be far more rapid and far more extensive than is the case at present, and the mortality among Latin students would be much smaller. Professor Nutting's paper goes far to show, if it does not prove completely by concrete evidence secured through actual trial, that this theory was correct. I had hardly dared to think seriously of the possibility that Latin might be started in the Public Schools earlier than it is at present, but again Professor Nutting's paper shows clearly that such an earlier beginning is not an impossibility. One State has already sanctioned it, in a part of the country some are none too apt to think of as devoted to cultural studies. It might very well be that the beginning of Latin at an earlier period, back in the Grammar Schools, and the use of the Direct Method there, in whole or in part, would help our cause mightily. At the meeting of The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, to be held at Iowa City, on April 9-10, Mr. Wilbert L. Carr, of the University High School, Chicago, is to read a paper on The Desirability of Latin in the Eighth Grade; the outline of the paper, as given in *The Classical Journal* 9.237, indicates that Mr. Carr holds much the same views on this subject as those set forth by Professor Nutting in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 7.154-157, on the basis of experience in California. That Mr. Carr, too, is to speak on the basis of experience will be seen by an examination of the quotations from an article by Professor Judd, of the School of Education, University of Chicago, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 7.9-10, 17-18. It would seem that concerted effort to bring about the introduction of Latin in the Grade Schools might now stand some chance of success. In that case we should come a step, at least, nearer to setting up again those conditions (I mean conditions of early acquaintance with Latin) which played so large a part in those good old days when the Direct Method of studying Latin had, as its present advocates seem to imply, the field to itself.

C. K.

### ANOTHER EXPERIMENT WITH THE DIRECT METHOD IN GREEK

Professor Robbins's article, An Experiment with the Direct Method in Greek, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7:54-55, prompts me to say that I have used Dr. Rouse's A First Greek Course with College classes for two or three terms and have found the book very helpful and stimulating.

I attended Dr. Rouse's classes at the Columbia Summer Session of 1912 and, as I observed his skill in teaching Latin without the aid of any text-book and with almost no English, I was eager to apply some, at least, of this method in my beginning Greek class, and was naturally prejudiced in favor of his text-books.

But, enthusiastic as I am about the viva voce method, I must admit that, on account of the objections mentioned by Professor Robbins, A First Greek Course is not at all adapted to the American High School; still I do feel that it can be used with profit in College classes which are beginning Greek, where the essentials of the language must be mastered in three or four months and the process of elimination and selection is of necessity employed to a large degree no matter what book is used.

I do not attempt to use all of the words given in the vocabularies or all of the reading-matter supplied by Dr. Rouse; in fact, my students compile their own note-books, using A First Greek Course largely for reference. These note-books (inspected from time to time) are so arranged at the outset by the students that they can put a new word or phrase in its proper pigeon-hole very quickly, thus keeping separate lists of all the *α* nouns, the *η* nouns, the masculine nouns of the first declension, the *α* nouns, etc. No English is written in these books; the Latin, German, or French equivalent may be inserted, if desired.

As much conversation as possible is employed, simply as a means to an end, i.e. to aid in the rapid mastery of the forms and syntax. I find that by means of this conversation (with girls at least) the interest generated diminishes the effort and increases the efficiency.

Professor Goodell of Yale advocated some time ago this principle (in an article on the teaching of Greek, in Monroe's Cyclopaedia of Education):

Make the language from the beginning a *speech*,—sounds in the ear first, immediately, then sounds produced by the learner, and lastly sounds written on paper,—always sounds. All that can be done without any conversation at all; but actual daily use between teacher and pupil is clear gain, the quickest way to reach our goal.

So, with this principle in mind, the first day I write on the black-board in a vertical column all the capitals of the Greek alphabet, pronouncing, as I write, their Greek names clearly and distinctly.

Then, using each capital as an initial letter, I affix the following names: 'Αθήνη, Βερενίκη, Γλόκη, Δωρίς, 'Ελένη, Ζωή, 'Ηρα, Θάλεια, 'Ιεζάβελ, Καλλιόπη, Λουκία, Μελομένη, Ναυσικάα, Ξανθίπη, 'Ογδόη, Πηνελόπη, 'Ρωξάνη, Σοφία, Τερψιχόρα, 'Τπαρία, Φυλλίς, Χλόη, Ψυχή, 'Ωκαλέα. Every letter of the alphabet is thus utilized.

To these names I add 'Αρτεμις, 'Αφροδίτη, Βασίβεια, Δάφνη, Ειρήνη, 'Ερμύνη, Εύγενία, 'Ιρις, Ανδία, Μέλαινα, Μέλισσα, Νιόβη, Φοίβη.

From this list each student selects a name for herself; Irene will naturally choose Ειρήνη, Doris Δωρίς, Hermine 'Ερμύνη, etc.

By drill on the pronunciation and the spelling of these names, the sounds and the names of the letters are learned in an amazingly short time.

Every Greek phrase used is first pronounced very distinctly by the teacher, written by the pupil on the black-board, corrected, copied in blank-books, and memorized, e.g.<sup>2</sup>: Χαίρετε, ὦ μαθηταί! Χαίρε καὶ σὺ, ὦ διδάσκαλε! πῶς ἔχετε τήμερον; καλῶς ἔχομεν. καὶ σὺ, πῶς ἔχεις; εὖ ἔχω, εὐχαριστῶ ὑμῖν.

Then by asking the pupils individually πῶς ἔχει ἡ μήτηρ σου, ὦ Ζωή; and πῶς ἔχουσιν αἱ ἀδελφαί σου, ὦ Μαρία; I secure a drill on the paradigm of the verb.

Much is learned and very rapidly and easily by the question θρομά σοι τί ἐστίν; and the answer 'Ελένη θρομά μοί ἐστιν.

Calling the roll in Greek for the first week or so teaches the verb 'to be': πάρεστι Δωρίς; — πάρεμι, etc. Later we progress to τίς ἀπεστι τήμερον; οὐδεμία ἀπεστιν, or Φοίβη ἀπεστιν and πῶσαι πάρεσιν; εἰκοσι πάρεσιν.

The way is paved for the third declension by the commands ἐλθέ, παρακαλῶ σε (later εἰ βοῦλε), ὦ Λουκία, πρὸς τὸν πίνακα καὶ γράφε τὸ θρομά σου 'Ελληνιστὶ ἐπὶ τῷ πίνακι, — κλῆε τὴν θύραν, — ἀνοιγε τὴν θυρίδα, etc. Later κλῆσον, ἀνοιξον, γράψον are substituted for the present imperatives.

The vocabularies are always developed before they are assigned for home-study. At first the articles in the room are named (as they are named the objects are held up, if possible, or pointed out). Here the conversation runs τί ἐστὶ τοῦτο; βιβλίον ἐστίν, κάλαμος, γραφή, ἔδρα, δωμάτιον, τράπεζα, etc., as the case may be.

Other words are developed by means of pictures. University prints, magazine illustrations, advertisements, cartoons, all are utilized. Some pupils even look ahead and supply me in advance with pictures to illustrate the new words.

Every week I give a vocabulary test by pinning up in different parts of the room pictures bearing numbers; the pupils write down on their papers the numbers from one to ten, fifteen or twenty as the

<sup>1</sup> I prefer the spelling 'Αθήνη to 'Αθηνα as from this list the rule for the use of *α* after *ε, ι, ρ* is easily developed.

<sup>2</sup> See Sprechen Sie Attisch, by E. Joannides.



case may be and opposite each figure the Greek word suggested by the picture bearing that number.

For sentence-structure a picture is given to each student; she takes it to the front of the room, holds it up for the class to see, then describes it and writes her sentence or sentences on the board. Careful questioning on the part of the teacher can bring out any point of syntax desired.

As soon as deponent verbs have been reached, drill is afforded by the following phrases taken from the Gouin Method: *ἔρχομαι πρὸς τὴν θύραν* — *ἐφίσταμαι ἐγγὺς τῆς θύρας* — *ἐκτείνω τὴν χεῖρα* — *ἐφάπτομαι τῆς κορῶνης* — *ἀνοίγω τὴν θύραν*.

Variety of drill can be given by the following commands and questions: *ἔλθε, ὦ Εἰρήνη, πρὸς τὴν θύραν!* — *ποῖ ἔρχεαι; πρὸς τὴν θύραν ἔρχομαι, ὦ διδάσκαλε.* — *ποῖ, ὦ μαθηταί, ἔρχεται Εἰρήνη; πρὸς τὴν θύραν ἔρχεται Εἰρήνη.* — *ἐφίστασο ἐγγὺς τῆς θύρας! ποῦ ἐφίστασαι; ἐγγὺς τῆς θύρας ἐφίσταται Εἰρήνη, etc.*

In addition to memorizing quite a number of the aphorisms culled by Dr. Rouse, the following stanzas adapted from the Modern Greek might be memorized for a drill on contract verbs, on the vocative of masculine nouns of agency, and on the adjective *πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν*.

*Πρὸς τὸν Πλάστον.*

*Σύνπασα ἡ φύσις,  
Πλάστα, σ' εὐλογεῖ,  
δένδρον, λόφος, βρύσις,  
οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ.*

*Πάντες (οἱ πᾶσαι) σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν,  
Πλάστα τοῦ παντός,  
καὶ δοξολογοῦμεν  
σὲ διὰ παντός.*

*τὰ δωρήματά σου  
δίδως ἐν στοργῇ·  
Πλάστα τ' ὀνομά σου  
τίς οὐκ εὐλογεῖ;*

*Πλάστα τῶν ἀγγέλων,  
Πλάστα τοῦ φωτός,  
νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸ μέλλον,  
εἰ εὐλογητός.*

In this way the essentials are mastered in about ten weeks of four periods a week and the rest of the term is devoted to the Gate to the Anabasis, and the Colloquia compiled by Professor Gleason for the use of those who favor the viva voce method. In the second semester the Anabasis itself is read, Gleason's prose book is used and a systematic review of forms and syntax is made from Goodwin's Grammar, and I feel that the foundation has been laid with more enthusiasm yet with just as much stress and accuracy as formerly.

NORMAL COLLEGE, New York City. JANE GRAY CARTER.

## REVIEW

Apollonius Rhodius, the Argonautica, with an English Translation by R. C. Seaton. New York: The Macmillan Company (1912). Pp. xiv + 432. \$1.50. The Argonautica of Apollonius. Edited, with Introduction and Commentary, by George W. Mooney. London and New York: Longmans, Green and Company (1912). Pp. 454. \$4.50.

All teachers and students and lovers of Vergil and Ovid, as well as of Apollonius himself, should be interested in these books. Some of the best passages in the Argonautica were copied by Ovid and Vergil, so that a prerequisite to a full appreciation of the fourth book of the Aeneid is a reading of the dramatic tetralogy of Apollonius, the earliest extant example of a love-romance in Greek literature. Vergil's portrayal of Dido can hardly be understood correctly without an acquaintance with Medea, a character so strong and intense that she will stand comparison in many respects with Dido, in the conception of whom Vergil owed much to Apollonius. The passage in the third book (802 ff.), where Medea considers suicide, but reflects that she is still young and life is sweet, is one of the masterpieces of Greek literature; it is not equalled by any words of Dido, who fails to move us as does the hapless Medea. Those who do not read Greek fluently will welcome Mr. Seaton's excellent translation, which is more accurate even than the poetic but literal version of Way. With its reminiscences of Milton (cf. for example, p. 405, "the star that bids the shepherd fold"), it is a decided advance over the antiquated renderings of Greene, Fawkes, Preston, and E. P. Coleridge, all of which, however, seem to have been used (cf., for example, p. 305, "like a dark wave, dumb and noiseless, rolling over a sluggish sea"—the exact words of Coleridge). The close kinship of Apollonius to our modern poets makes the Argonautica easy to translate, and Professor Seaton has given us a very attractive prose version, although single words are sometimes left untranslated, and his English at times does not have the virility of the Greek, nor the excellence of the French translation of De Mirmont. The Greek text is that of Seaton's own Oxford edition, with a few changes. The introduction and the bibliography of ten pages are admirably suited to the purpose of the Loeb Classical Library. However, the phrase (p. vi), "he was honoured with the libraries of the Museum" is not a very intelligible equivalent of *τῶν βιβλιοθηκῶν τοῦ μουσείου ἀξιοθῆναι*, and from p. xiii one might not realize that there were at least 26, and not 12, Mss of the Argonautica. This book, on the whole, is better than many of the previous volumes of the Loeb series, but there is still room for improvement in the general flimsiness of the book, in the quality of the paper, in the typography, in the price, and in the

matter of proof-reading, which has been so defective in many of the other volumes, and still is not as perfect as one would like. A rapid reading has revealed numerous misprints in the Greek. In the translation we have (p. 15), "Parthenie, the seat of Imbrasion Hera"; on p. 75, "Zelus" for *Zelys*; p. 275, "the sun was sailing beneath the dark earth"; p. 287, "likes pines" for *like pines*; p. 317, "his doom" for *her doom*; p. 375, "isle of Macris" is not the exact equivalent for Μακριδής . . . χερήσιοι; on p. 391 we have "Eretheis" for *Erytheis*; on p. 403, "Nireus" for *Nereus*; on p. 413, "when they had loosed the hawsers thrice" for *thence*. It would have been advisable also to explain such epithets as Icmæus (p. 139), and other proper names, if explanatory notes are to be added at all: such notes are added for Embasius (p. 27), Actius (p. 31), etc. The expression "Cyprian goddess" (used only once: p. 131) is more intelligible than "Cypris" (the usual rendering of Mr. Seaton), and *Meleager* is more familiar than "Meleagrus", the form of this name always used by Mr. Seaton. In 1.99, τηλόγετον means, as the scholium says, 'born to him in old age', rather than "well-beloved". In 1.149, οὐδ' ἀπείθεσεν νησομένους is not precisely rendered by "nor did she forbid their departure". In 1.262, μήτηρ δ' ἄμφ' αὐτὸν βεβλημένη is translated "smitten with grief for Jason". It means, rather, 'falling on his neck', as line 268 shows, where Mr. Seaton correctly translates, "And even as the mother had thrown her arms about her son" (omitting as often the translation of a word or two, here of τὰ πρῶτα). If Mr. Seaton's translation were correct, we should expect a dative like ἄτῃ in 1.1216. 1.320, στή δ' ἄρ' ἐπὶ προμολῇ, is awkwardly translated "and he stood at the entering in"; it probably means 'at the foot of the promontory on which Pagasæ stood', though Way and Coleridge translate "There she (the Argo) stood at the river's mouth". In 1.923, the average reader would hardly realize that "the Black Sea" is not what we mean by the phrase, but the Gulf of Saros. In 2.15 ὀμίλου depends on οἶον, not on ἀποκριδόν; μέγας λίθος, 2.1172, is a large stone, not a "black stone"; in 3.117 ἀστράγαλοι, 'knucklebones', are not "dice". The game was more like that of jack-stones. In 3.128 γναθμοῖο κατασχομένη is rather 'grasping him by the chin' than "laying her hands on his lips"; in 3.218, γλυφίδεσσιν is 'capitals' rather than "triglyphs", according to the Etymologicum Magnum and the scholium. In 3.1091 Mr. Seaton reads ἐν δ' αὐτῇ Ἰαωλῶς, but translates "and in it stands Iolcus", as if he read ἐν δ' αὐτῇ. 4.188 means 'he placed the fleece at the stern, setting the maiden thereon', rather than "he led the maiden to the stern, and seated her there"; 4.255 means 'the course was unknown to all', rather than "to all alike his meaning was dim". In 4.267 Ἡερή is translated "Morning-land". Egypt, the far-off or dimly seen, or misty, is meant. The scholium interprets it as

'black-soiled'. 4.1604 means 'when a man leads a swift steed to the wide circle of the race-course', rather than "when a man trains a mighty steed for the broad race-course". But these are quibbles. The translation is really very satisfactory, and can be highly commended.

Mr. Mooney's edition of the Argonautica is a pioneer, and has, as he himself says, at least the merit of freshness. The last English edition, by Shaw, was first published in 1777, so that Mr. Mooney deserves great credit for bringing together so much matter, and reviving an interest in Apollonius among English scholars. The work is a good beginning, and will always prove valuable for the interpretation of the Greek text. The critical notes are taken in great part from Merkel. The explanatory notes deal mostly with the meaning of the Greek words, and constantly correct Liddell and Scott, as Mr. Seaton had already done in American Journal of Philology 9.85 ff., and in The Classical Review 2.83 ff. For etymology Curtius is cited time and time again, so that false etymologies are often quoted. On page 126, by exception, the etymology suggested by Rawlinson on Herodotus 2.51 for *Cabiri*, as from the Semitic *kabir*, 'great', is given; but even here the etymology is not true, for the analogy of *mag-iros* (cf. *masso*, *mag-*), the proper names Kabaisos in Mantinea and Kabon in Laconia, and the complete identity in form and similarity in character with Sanskrit Kabeiras show conclusively that the word is not Semitic (cf. Hopkins, Journal American Oriental Society, 32.55 ff. and my remarks in American Journal of Archaeology 17.365). An Indo-European origin from the root *kav-*, 'to burn', suggested by Welcker, Aeschyleische Trilogie, 161 ff., by Lenormant (Daremberg-Saglio 1.757), and by others is much to be preferred (cf., also, the recent works of Fick, Hattiden und Danubier im Griechenland, 48, who rejects the Semitic etymology, and Miss Bennett, Religious Cults Associated with the Amazons, 24). Why in any case refer to Rawlinson rather than to Preller-Robert or Roscher, s.v. Megaloi Theoi, or Gruppe, or some other of the authorities cited in A. J. A. 17.365, all of whom give the literature on the subject? Long before Rawlinson the Semitic etymology was suggested by Scaliger, Grotius, Bochart, etc.

For grammar and syntax Monro and Goodwin are cited, but no acquaintance is shown with the work of Stahl or with that of Gildersleeve or his pupils. The result is that the commentary gives no interpretation of the syntax of Apollonius in comparison with classical authors and especially with other Hellenistic writers. Questions of dialect are rarely mentioned. So, for example, not a word is said about *Μυρτώσιον*, 3.505, instead of Callimachus's *Μυρτώσιον*. The form with *ω* is not epic, but represents the native Doric

word, as Malten, Kyrene, 56, suggested, and as the inscription published by me in A. J. A. 17.168 shows; furthermore, the reference is to the acropolis of Cyrene itself, not to a headland. Geographical allusions to peoples and places and persons are explained, but only such information is given as could be found in any elementary classical dictionary. A map would have been more economical, since no real knowledge is betrayed of the places themselves, or of the investigations at or about those sites; and no special study has been made of the geography of the trip, or even of the literary development of the love of geographical description from Homer and Aeschylus down. So, for example, in the commentary on the Cyanean rocks, or Symplegades (1.3; 4.304, 786, etc.) we have no reference to the passages about these rocks in Herod. 4.89; Geographi Minores 1, pp. 401, 422, 2.71; Strabo 7.6.1; Pliny, N.H. 4.92. Not a word is said about the dangerous rocks which still exist near the entrance to the Black Sea, both on the European and on the Asiatic side (cf. Joanne, Grèce et Turquie, 600). The Homeric forms are explained, and the parallel passages in Vergil (always spelt Virgil by Mr. Mooney) and Valerius Flaccus, as well as in some earlier Greek authors, are tabulated; but there is little reference to other authors who were influenced by Apollonius (except on pages 45, 46, where Varro, Catullus, Propertius, Ovid, Lucan are barely mentioned). Milton is quoted frequently, and Swinburne and Shakespeare once or twice; but other English writers are neglected. The translations of Coleridge and Way, in whose Tale of the Argonauts Mr. Mooney, strange to say, finds much poetic charm, are often cited and corrected; but not a word occurs about William Morris's Life and Death of Jason, or Dyer's The Fleece, or Tennyson's Aeson and King Athamas. Way is even quoted (pp. 13-14) for the words of Robinson Ellis about Apollonius, and no reference to Ellis's own article is given (an example of Mr. Mooney's method).

The Introduction is a good compilation from Merkel, De Mirmont, Weichert, and others, and gives the essential facts about the life of Apollonius and his quarrels with Callimachus, the sources of the Argonautica, the nature of the poem itself, other works of Apollonius, manuscripts of the Argonautica (without, however, any mention of the manuscript preserved in the monastery of Mt. Sinai), scholia, editions, and translations.

The Greek text is mainly that of Seaton and Merkel, but with several variations. So in 1.517, 987; 2.160; 4.1647 Mr. Mooney gives his own conjectures. In several other passages he adopts a different reading from that approved by Mr. Seaton. So in 1.8, Mooney reads *μετέπειτα τὴν*, Seaton *ἐπειτ'*; in 1.71, 73, and 2.1039 he reads *Ἐρυβώτης* and speaks of Erybotes, which is not so correct as Seaton's

*Ἐρυβώτης* (cf. Valerius Flaccus 1.402; 3.478; Hyginus, Fabula 14, not cited by Mooney); in 1.103, again, Mooney's reading *κοιμήν*, is not so good as Seaton's *κελήν*, which was read by the scholia, and introduced into the text by Boesch; in 2.984 Mooney reads *ἀκρην*, Seaton *ἀχρην*; in 2.1172 Mooney reads *μέλας*, Seaton has Brunck's *μέγας* (probably a mistake, however); in 3.1091 Mooney reads *αὐτῇ*, Seaton *αὐτῆς*; in 4.289 Mooney reads *ἡψην*, Seaton *ἰοίην*; in 4.336 Mooney reads *ἀκτὰς . . . νήσων*, Seaton *ἄλλας . . . νήσους*; in 4.502, Mooney has *ῥ'*, Seaton *ῥδ'*; in 4.787 Mooney has *πάρος*, Seaton *πυρός*; in 4.1030 Mooney has *ἐραμοιβαδὶς*, Seaton *ἐραμοιβαδὶς*; in 4.1287 Mooney *φαείνη*, Seaton *φαείνη*; in 4.1604 Mooney has *ἐς*, Seaton *ἐπ'*. An excellent first appendix discusses the double recension and a second appendix treats at length of meter. Indices of proper names and of Greek words discussed in the notes follow; but there is no subject-index.

The main criticism to be made is that Mr. Mooney has not studied exhaustively the larger aspects of the Argonautica. In a pretentious and costly edition like this, we have a right to expect from the editor some acquaintance with the development of the epic, and with Apollonius's style and manner and art in comparison with those of other Hellenistic writers and later Epics. We expect some acquaintance with the romances of later days, with the history of the different legends, with folk-lore, with archaeology, especially the vase-tradition, and with topography, to determine how much fantastic mythology is mingled with real geography. We expect a discussion of the characters in the Argonautica, at least of Jason and Medea, and the history of the traditions connected with them. Above all in America, where Apollonius is not so neglected as in Great Britain, we expect an acquaintance with the important literature which has appeared in American publications, and especially at Johns Hopkins. It is a poor excuse to say, as Mr. Mooney does, that the literature is scattered and in many cases quite unprocurable, since a letter to any particular author would undoubtedly have procured a free copy of his monograph or article for use in a commentary on Apollonius. C. J. Goodwin's treatise on Apollonius's Syntax, and Oswald's dissertation on Prepositions in Apollonius are known to Mr. Mooney, probably because Mr. Seaton reviewed the latter for The Classical Review. Mooney evidently has the idea so common in English publications that American articles are a negligible quantity, although he credits (p. 14) to The American Journal of Philology an article by Seaton which appeared in the English Journal of Philology. He has not seen Haggett, A Comparison of Apollonius Rhodius with Homer in Prepositional Usage (1902; this has several things not in Oswald), Bolling, The Participle in Apollonius Rhodius (Studies in Honor of Basil L.



Gildersleeve, 1902), Gildersleeve and Miller, *The Vocative in Apollonius Rhodius* (A. J. P. 24 [1903], 198-199, 221-230), Fitch's review of Seaton's text of Apollonius, in A. J. P. 32 (1901), 326-331, nor has he paid any attention to the important monograph of one of my own former students, Dr. Elderkin, whose elaborate theory of the speech of the crow in 3.932 ff. should be noted, even if not accepted, and who has many important remarks on the speech in Apollonius, in which he points out differences from Homer as well as resemblances to Homer (cf. his *Aspects of the Speech in the later Greek Epic*). Since Mr. Mooney's book appeared, Dr. Elderkin has published an article on Repetition in Apollonius, A. J. P. 34 (1913), 198 ff. And in *Harvard Studies* 24.162 ff. there is a summary of an interesting dissertation by Carroll, *De Motibus Animi apud Poetas Epicos Homerum Apolloniumque expressis*. A perusal of my monograph on Ancient Sinope would have improved Mr. Mooney's commentary on 2.948 ff., where references should be given to Avienus, Tzetzes, Plutarch's Lucullus 23, Ps.-Scymnus, Scholium to Her. 2.104, Scylax, and others who, like Apollonius, speak of Sinope as in Assyria or Syria (cf. A. J. P. 27 [1906], 146, 147, 150). Likewise, in A. J. P. 27.150, it was shown how Apollonius in 2.948-967 combines two traditions, which are given separately in other authors—Strabo, Apollodorus, Plutarch, Appian, Ps.-Scymnus. But Mooney gives no comment at all on the names Deimachus, Deileon, Autolycus, Phlogius, Heracles, and the numerous traditions connected with them, except a reference to Valerius Flaccus. Why not refer to Strabo 12.545; Apollod. 1.9.16; Plut. Luc. 23 (where we have Demoleon, not Deileon); Appian Mithr. 12.83; Ps.-Scymnus 944 ff.; Peripl. Pont. Eux. 22; Hyginus Fab. 14, etc.? For Heracles at Sinope cf. A. J. A. 9 (1905), 305; and for Phlogius, *ibid.*, 306.

Perhaps, however, we Americans should not complain, for Mr. Mooney has also disregarded many important German scholars, such as Stahl, Reitzenstein, and Malten; if he had even read the chapter on Apollonius in the fifth edition of Christ's *Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur* (II, 1, pp. 104 ff.), he could have improved his edition. For example, he would have discovered on p. 109 that verses 1.774-794 occur in Amherst Papyri 2.16, and verses 3.262-271 in Oxyrhynchus Papyri 6, No. 874. Nor does he know the papyri fragments of Apollonius which give the text of 2.101-110; 3.145-161, 175-190, 263-271, 727-745, 908-914; 4.77-90, etc. (cf. Oxyr. Pap. 9.1179; Hermes 35.605; Oxyr. Pap. 6.874; 4.690-692). So in 2.104, Brunck's reading, followed by Mooney, ἀμφότεροις ἐκέσθη, is not supported, but a papyrus reads ἀμφότεροις κέσθη; in his note on 3.158, Mooney says Gerhard's reading, μεγάλοις, is tame and otiose, but does not tell us that it occurs in a Strassburg papyrus. The reading adopted by

Mooney for 3.158 is inconsistent with 3.114, and probably we should adopt Reitzenstein's interpretation of the papyrus (cf. Hermes 35.607). In 3.263 the papyrus is consistent with Brunck's conjecture ἐφημοσύνησιν, but in 1.271 it reads ἀμφεπένοιντο for Brunck's ἀμφιπένοιντο, adopted by Mooney; in 3.739, the papyrus agrees with the Mss in omitting 1.739 cited by the scholia to L.; in 1.745 we have confirmation of Porson's ναυῖλοι. Mooney's reading, ναῦται, should now disappear from the text. In 3.909, Mooney adopts Stephanus's reading μετὰ for κατὰ, but does not know that it has the authority of a papyrus. In 4.80 a papyrus reads ἐν' ἰκρύβειν, not ἀν' ἰκρύβειν, as Mooney reads. So also an acquaintance with the fragments of Callimachus's Aetia and Iambi would have furnished an important parallel to the story of Aristaeus in 2.500-527 (cf. Oxyr. Pap. 7.1011, ll. 33 f.; cf. *ibid.* ll. 12, 15, 25, for parallels to 2.1216; 3.1395; 2.936).

Not merely a knowledge of the papyri excavated, but of archaeological work in general would have been beneficial; a final commentary on a work so full of geography and of folk-lore demands such knowledge. In the commentary on 1.14-87 we should expect at least a reference to the excavations and researches in Thessaly and Phthiotis by Arvanitopoulos, Vortselas, etc. For Caeneus (1.59) we need references to Iliad 1.264 and scholia, and to Hesiod, Shield of Heracles 178-190, to Hyginus and to representations of Caeneus in sculpture and on vases, etc.; a discussion of the folk-lore connected with Caeneus would also be in place (cf. *Journal Hellenic Society* 17.294 f.; Baur, Centaurs, etc.). For κατὰ γῆν (1.64) cf. συναγῆν in Hesiod, Shield of Heracles 189. For Hera on Samos (1.187, 188), we should have a reference to Wiegand's important excavation of the Samian Heraeum; for Clarus a reference to the discovery of the Clarian oracle by Makridi Bey (*Oesterreichische Jahreshefte* 1906, 1912); for Pagasae (1.318) some allusion to the remarkable discoveries there by Arvanitopoulos; for the Dictaeon cave and the Curetes (1.509, 1130-1136; 2.1233; 3.134) to the excavation of the cave and the discoveries there, and to the important hymn of the Curetes found at Palaikastro, which dates a little before the time of Apollonius (*British School Annual* 15.308 f.); for the Cabiri (1.916) we want a reference to the Cabirium in Samothrace, the Cabirium near Thebes, and the Cabiric vases; for Cyzicus (1.936 f.) to the material collected by Fitch in A. J. P. 33.43 ff. and to *British School Annual* 7.191; for 2.25 f. to the Ficoroni cista; for 2.41, 60 to some of the many examples in Greek and Roman art of the star associated with Pollux; for Phineus in 2.178, to Greek vases (cf. Furtwängler-Reichhold, *Griechische Vasenmalerei* 1, plate XLI, pp. 209, 302 ff. and references there); for Carambis (2.361) references to Strabo 125, 309, Pliny N. H. 4.86; for

Cyrene (2.500 f.; 4.1750) to the monographs of Studniczka and Malten, and the American excavations there; for the river Sangarius (2.722) to Pliny N. H. 6.1, Iliad 16.719, Hasluck's *Cyzicus*, 246, etc., Ramsay, *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, 134, 155, etc.; for Nysa (2.905; 4.431) to Petermann's *Mitteilungen* 8-9, and especially to Malten, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 12; for roofless temples (2.1170) to actual examples, such as the temples at Didyma and Samos; for the game of astragali, played not merely by boys, but by girls and adults (3.117), to some of the numerous works of art illustrating the game (cf. Van Hoorn, *De Vita Puerorum*, 60, 64-68). So on a vase in the British Museum (E 501), just as in Apollonius, we have Ganymede and Eros playing the game, which occurs so often in works of art that we cannot say that Apollonius had in mind the group of Polyclitus. For Adrasteia (1.1116; 3.133) we may refer to coins in Head, *Historia Numorum*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 661, 667, to Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, 170, 432 (cf. Hasluck's *Cyzicus*, 48, 220; Strabo 575, 588); for *αἰάριος* (3.140), to Od. 7.87, and the finds of *αἰάριος* at Tiryns, Crete, etc.; for Minos (3.997, 1000, 1098-1107) and Cnossus (4.434), to excavations at Cnossus and the Minoan finds. For Theseus and Ariadne (3.997; 4.434) and Cadmus (3.1179) reference should be made to the vases; for wealthy Orchomenus (3.1073, 1094) a reference to Bulle's *Orchomenus* would be better than one to Schliemann. In the commentary on the bull-fight (3.1278 ff.) it would have been instructive to have a short history of the bull-fight from Minoan times on, especially as it was so common in Thessaly. For Circe (4.662 ff.) we should like references to Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 2.103, Horace *Epod.* 17.17, Valerius Flaccus 6.445, etc., and to the vases (cf. Müller, *Odyssee-Illustrationen*); we should be told also that Circe and Medea were the two great enchantresses of antiquity (cf. Tibullus 2.5. 55 ff.; Propertius 2.1.53). For the marriage of Peleus and Thetis refer to the François and other vases, and to Pindar P.3.85, N.4; for the birth of Athena (4.1310) and for the Hesperides (4.1427), and for Talus (4.1638) to vases, especially Furtwängler-Reichhold, *Griechische Vasenmalerei*, 1, pp. 196 ff., plates 38, 39.

A knowledge of folk-lore and religion also would have benefited the commentary in many places, e.g. at 1.1063, which refers to the custom of wives dying with their departed husbands. At 2.531, the twelve gods should be enumerated in the order in which the scholium gives them, and the history of their canonization, which does not appear till the Hymn to Hermes, should be briefly discussed. References might be given to other authors who mention the twelve, and at least to the altar in the Louvre where they appear in the same order as in the scholium to

Apollonius, except that Hephaestus goes with Athena, and Hermes with Hestia. In 2.1011, the custom of the *couvade*, or man-childbed, might receive more comment (cf. Valerius Flaccus 5.150), and a reference should be made to Ploss, *Das Kind*, 143 f. rather than to Tylor. For the sacred black stone in 2.1172, compare Miss Bennett, *Religious Cults Associated with the Amazons*, 17. For the sacrifice of horses in 2.1176 compare *ibid.*, 70; Iliad 21.130; Paus. 3.20.4; Preller-Robert, *Griechische Mythologie*, 343, n. 5; Verrall, *Journal Hellenic Society*, 18 (1898), 1 ff.; Stengel in *Philologus* 1880, 182 f., and in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 1905, 203 f.; Farnell, *Greek Cults* 4.20 ff.; 5.419, etc. The horse-sacrifice is rare in Greek ritual, occurring on Mt. Taygetus and in Rhodes, in honor of Helios, and occasionally elsewhere, in honor of Poseidon; but it is frequent among the Romans, Slavs, Persians, Vedic Indians, Semites, and Chinese (cf. Frazer, Paus. 4.198; Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, 330). On the survival of barbarism which we have in the story of the murder of Apsyrtus 1.477 ff., which Mooney wrongly says is not referred to by any other ancient writer, we need a reference to Aeschylus fr. 354. Rohde, *Psyche* 1.326, and Matthies, *Die Praenestinenischen Spiegel*, 23, have many other parallels. For purifications after bad dreams (4.663) compare also Sophocles, *El.* 645; Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1338, and scholium; Plut. *De Superstit.* 166a; Theophrastus *Char.* 16.11; Porphyry, *De Abstinencia* 4.7; Propertius 3.8.11; Martial 11.50, etc. In 4.800, for Themis compare Miss Harrison's *Themis* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 7.86-88). For the prodigies in 4.1284 we have a reference to Tibullus 2.5.75 (with the lines quoted in a wrong order), and Vergil *Georgics* 1.478; but such prodigies are recorded also in Verg. *Aen.* 2.173, Livy 43.13, Ovid *Met.* 15.792, and many other places. For the swan's song (4.1301) see Plato *Phaedo* 84E; Callimachus *Hymn. Del.* 252; Hor. *Carm.* 2.20.15, 4.3.20; Frazer, Paus. 2.395, etc.

Many mistakes and misprints occur, some of which are corrected in a page of Addenda and Corrigenda. But I have noticed many that have not been corrected. There is, however, no room to enumerate them here.

This all too long review can only justify itself because of the importance of Mr. Mooney's book. It is the first modern attempt to annotate Apollonius in English. He has given us a first-rate school-boy's edition; but, as I have tried to show, his work lacks finality, and many topics remain to be considered, many notes to be made more thorough in another edition. Now that Mr. Mooney has entered this field, and is familiar with Apollonius, let us hope he will continue his Apollonian studies, and give us such a final commentary.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.